REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner for meeting with Applicant's representative in an interview held on February 28, 2008.

Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims of record is respectfully requested. Currently, claims 1-10, 12-21, 23-31, 33-50, 52-61, 63-71, and 73-85 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-8, 14-16, 18, 20-21, 23-29, 35-37, 39-48, 54-56, 58, 60-69, 75-77, 80, and 81-85 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Othmer et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,167,358 hereinafter "Othmer") in view of Wygodny et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,282,701 hereinafter "Wygodny"). Applicant respectfully submits that the applied references fail to teach or suggest each of the elements of the claims. Thus Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

For example, independent claim 81 recites, *inter alia*, "providing, in response to said user information from the first user, at least a first bug tracking related menu, the contents of which vary based on the first user's role in the software development process" and "providing, in response to said user identification information from the second user, at least a second bug tracking related menu, different from the first bug tracking menu, the contents of which vary based on the second user's role in the software development process."

Applicant submits that the prior art of record at least fails to teach making decisions based on a user's role, and varying the contents of a menu, based on a user's role or otherwise.

The Office Action concedes that Othmer does not disclose "a second bug tracking related menu specifically tailored to the second user's role in the software development process, wherein the first and second bug tracking menus are different from each other." Wygodny is introduced as compensating for this deficiency of Othmer.

Wydogny, however, at best only teaches a single user, a developer, viewing the menu thereof. Thus, even if Wygodny was said to teach a first menu, there is no teaching or suggestion of a second menu, different from the first menu and tailored to a second user's role.

Further, the menus of Wygodny are not taught to be varied based on any criteria, they are simply presented as shown in the figures or otherwise described in the disclosure to the person launching the program.

Thus, Wygodny does not cure the noted deficiencies of Othmer.

For at least this reason, claim 81 should be allowable. Claim 61 contains similar recitations and should be allowable at least for similar reasons. Claims 62-69, 75-77, 80, and 82-85 should be allowable based at least on their dependency from allowable claims.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "providing, in response to said user identification information, at least one bug tracking related menu, the contents of which vary based on the user's role in the software development process."

The Office Action concedes that Othmer does not teach or suggest "at least one bug tracking related menu tailored to the user's role in the software development process."

Wygodny is introduced to compensate for this deficiency of Othmer. As previously noted, Wygodny only teaches a single user and does not mention either tailoring menus or tailoring anything based on a user role.

While Wygodny does teach a single set of menus, used to create a trace control information file, claim 1's recitation that the menus be tailored and that they be tailored to a role necessarily requires that there be more than one type of menu and role. Otherwise the notion of tailoring the menus based on a role would be meaningless.

Finally, even if Othmer or Wygodny does teach users having different roles, there is nothing to teach or suggest that menus would be tailored based on those roles. Rather, it would be reasonable, absent such teaching, to assume that everyone gets the same set of menus when logging into a system, as that is a conventional method for providing software menus.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1, 21, and 41 are allowable. Claims 2-8, 14-16, 18, 20, 23-29, 35-37, 39, 40, 42-48, 54-56, 58, and 60 should be allowable based at least on their dependency from allowable independent claims.

Claims 9-13, 30-34, 49-53 and 70-74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Othmer and Wygodny in view of Johndrew et al. (U.S.

Publication no. 2001/0049697, hereinafter "Johndrew"). Claims 17, 38, 57 and 78 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Othmer and Wygodny in view of admitted prior art (Applicant's specification, page 2, lines 9-11, hereinafter "prior art"). Claims 19, 40, 59 and 79 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Othmer in view of Tse (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,754, hereinafter "Tse"). Neither Johndrew, the prior art, nor Tse cures the above noted deficiencies of the Othmer/Wygodny combination with respect to the base independent claims, however. Thus, based at least on their dependency from allowable independent claims, these claims should all be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes that all the claims are in condition for allowance, and an action to that end is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number identified below.

<div align="right">

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Bernard P. Tomsa/
Bernard P. Tomsa
Reg. No. 60,121
</div>

BPT:bpt
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

1137676